Development Engineering Advisory Board Meeting
April 9, 2009
2:30 – 4:30 p.m.
Public Service Center
6th Floor Training Room

In attendance: Board members – Eric Golemo, Steve Madsen, Jerry Nutter, Tim Schauer; County staff – Sue Stepan, Ginger Blair

Board members not in attendance: John Graves, Greg Jellison, Steve Wall

Visitors: David Bottamini, Mark Gassaway, Marty Snell

Administrative Actions
- Nutter started the meeting with introduction of audience and board members.
- The March 5, 2009, meeting minutes were adopted without edits.
- Parking Lot items were reviewed; no new items were added. It was decided that items that have been moved to the 2009 work plan can be removed from the Parking Lot.
- There were no new correspondences to review.

Approve 2008 Annual Report / 2009 Priorities
The group briefly reviewed the draft 2008 Annual Report and the 2009 Priorities.
Madsen pointed out that the Annual Report refers to the rewrite of Title 40 for simplicity and clarity as a priority for 2009, but it is not an item on the Work Plan and Priorities document.

It was determined that any additional edits were to be sent to Stepan by end of day on Monday, April 13.

Nutter commented that he spoke with Commissioner Stuart and feels confident that the DEAB will receive positive feedback as well as clear direction from the BOCC. He sensed that the commissioners will want to talk about fees, code rewrites, and streamlined permitting.

The group discussed the commissioner's idea regarding the county accepting signed and stamped plans without an engineering review. It was agreed that DEAB will need to bring to attention the risks associated with that concept.

Additional topics discussed at this time included:
- County's risk for liability and costs when something goes wrong in a project.
- The county reporting bad engineers to the Board of Registration of Professional Engineers.
- Currently, the level of service is limited due to the need to match the amount of fees being collected.
- The ability to allow a client to buy more service. If a client wants more meetings for example, have a fee available for that.

Development Engineering Program Report
Stepan addressed the group and referred to the provided handout. She explained that the report addresses three main areas: the 2009/2010 budget, January/February financial reports, and current levels of service.

Stepan lead the group through the report, with the following being discussed:

1. Program Overview
   - These pages are an excerpt from the Public Works orientation report. They summarize staffing and budgets for Development Engineering. The department's goals for 2009 include a focus on timelines, with a target of conducting 90% of the reviews within the timelines.
2. 2009-2010 Budget and Overhead Rate
   - Development Engineering has a new structure now that it is a part of Public Works. There are three program areas within Development Engineering that are financially tracked: Administration, Development Fee Projects, and Non-Development Fee Projects.
   - Typically, an engineer is only charging 10% of their available time (excluding holidays/vacation/other leave) to administration. All other time is charged directly to projects.
3. Hourly Rates by Job Classification
   - The overhead rate is calculated at 86.31%. This equals a salary-only multiplier of 2.57.
   - The average hourly billing rate is based on actual staff.
4. Revenue Forecast and Actual Receipts
   - The revised forecasts from the external group meeting conducted two weeks ago are not reflected on this document.
   - Revenue is not coming in less than forecasted. The original forecast of about $1 million in revenue has dropped to about $800,000.
   - The ability to temporarily assign staff to other programs within Public Works is very important.
   - Development Engineering is still trying to resolve with Community Development the amount of general fund transfer to support the development engineering program.
   - Time and expenses for non-development fee activities are specifically tracked. A policy discussion is needed as to if these activities should continue and how they should be funded (such as general fund).
   - Policy decisions are also needed regarding public service activities. When there is high non-applicant activity on a development, should the cost be spread to the developer or is it a public service?
5. General Fund and Reimbursable Expenses
   - This document shows the actual expenses with overhead for each non-development fee project and the hours spent for January and February.
   - This document also shows the activities that are reimbursed by others, such as the inspectors doing non-development related work for Capital Construction.
6. Specific Project Expenses and 2009 Revenue
   - This is a typical report that shows the expense and revenue status for each active permit project since January 1, 2009.
7. Specific Project Expenses for Revenue Prior to 2009
   - This is a typical report that shows project expenses in which the fees were received in 2008 and the funds went to Community Development. The projects are still active and staff is still billing time to them. Development Engineering will be reimbursed from Community Development for this work.

8. Performance Measurements
   - This document shows the performance measures for Development Engineering, with focus being on measuring the work load, efficiency, and timeline compliance.
   - Some measurements show N/A because they are quarterly or annual numbers and are not available yet.
9. Level of Service and Fee Comparison
   - Six typical permit types are included.
   - For each permit, the current maximum hours to perform the work (based on the current fee) are compared to the historical hours to perform the work.
   - The historical hours are based on an average "good" project, it does not capture the problem projects that are hard to predict. There are few projects that would require fewer hours, but there are many projects that require more hours.

Stepan concluded by informing the group that she will share these reports with the DEAB regularly.

Madsen commented that there appears to be more of a culture in Public Works that is directed toward accountability and reporting than there is in Community Development.

Stepan responded that historically, the priority for Community Development was directed at customer service and satisfying applicants. There were no constraints on budgets or time to perform reviews. A different business model is now in place where the level of service provided to applicants is limited by the fee collected. DEAB and the BOCC may receive complaints due to this reduction in service.

Prep for BOCC Work Session
It was determined that Stepan and Blair will create an agenda to accompany the meeting packet. Stepan will reserve a meeting room for the morning of the work session, if Jellison and Nutter want to meet informally.

Community Development Fees
Marty Snell addressed the group, providing an update on the budget and financial circumstances for Community Development.

The Community Development fees were a moving target before the 2009/2010 budget was adopted and it has continued to be a moving target after the budget adoption. He has been working with the auditor's office and the budget office. He is now faced with the challenge of losing Jerry Dolezal who recently resigned.

Snell had a conference call with King County, who has a system in place that includes review fees based on an hourly rate. They have fixed fees for building permits. Land use review fees are a base fee plus an hourly rate. King County has struggled with the four different systems they have to support them, and are in the process of converting to one system. King County issues approximately 3,000 billings each month and has one or two staff serving as collection agents.

Snell informed DEAB that he is not just looking at a fee proposal, but is looking at the budget issues from expenses to the general fund and fee revenue. Regarding time analysis, they will need to determine what work is fee based work and what is non-fee based work. They will need to determine what is code or policy work, what is general customer service. They will also need to identify what work is support to the BOCC or Community Planning.

A time tracking system is needed, whether integrated with payroll or the Tidemark permit system.

<u>Public Comment Period</u>
There were no additional public comments at this time.

Meeting Minutes Prepared by: Ginger Blair
Reviewed by: Sue Stepan
Board Adopted: __May 7, 2009_____

Development Engineering Advisory Board - Parking Lot Items

#	PRIORITY*	SUBJECT	DATE REQUESTED	ORIGINATOR	ACTION
1.	2	Invite other public agencies within county to collaborate on regional issues; possibly a dedicated mtg.	11/9/2006		Moved to 2009 Work Plan
2.	2	Formalize/better advertise complaint process on specific projects. (maybe a Customer service input form for ENG applicants)	12/7/2006		Moved to 2009 Work Plan
3.	2	Discuss final lot grading with Jim Muir.	2/1/2007		Moved to 2009 Work Plan
4.	2	Clarification and compilation of policies	5/03/07		Moved to 2009 Work Plan
5.	3	DEAB to meet with the Neighborhood Assoc of Clark County to present goals and receive feedback.	1/4/2007		Moved to 2009 Work Plan
6.	2	Routing of signing/striping plans	8/21/2008	Schulte	Moved to 2009 Work Plan
7.	2	Create a Type 1A land use category (between Type 1 and 2)	9/4/2008	DEAB	Moved to 2009 Work Plan
10.	1	ADA Compliance	10/06/08	DEAB	Moved to 2009 Work Plan
* Priorities: 1 = High/Important, 2 = Average, 3 = Low/long-term goal					